

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application: Jyawook, et al.

Serial No.: 10,077,427

Filed: 02/15/2002

Group Art Unit: 1771

Examiner: Vo, Hai

For: THERMOPLASTIC VEHICLE WEATHER STRIPPING

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 24 2003

OFFICIAL

RESPONSE

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on August 4, 2003
(Paper No. 6).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103. There is no motivation for making any of the combinations proposed by the Examiner and, therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness. Nothing in the art suggests making the combinations and hindsight reasoning based upon Applicant's disclosure cannot be used.

Claims 1, 3-7, 15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the combination of *Olson* and *Park, et al.* There is no motivation for making the combination because there is no benefit to *Olson* for adding a material made by the process disclosed in *Park, et al.* The *Olson* weather stripping includes flocked